

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application,. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066 (Whalen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,834,341 (Bahl). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Whalen in view of Bahl (see note below regarding Bahl) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,015 B1 (Phillips).

As an initial note, in a telephonic conversation with the Examiner on February 10, 2006, the Examiner stated that with regard to the rejection of Claim 8, reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,564,060 B1 (Haogland) is a typographical error and should be substituted with U.S. Patent No. 6,834,341 (Bahl). Accordingly, the following remarks are responsive to this change.

Turning to the Office Action, Claims 1-9 remain pending in the present application, with all claims being rejected. The Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066 (Whalen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,834,341 (Bahl). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Whalen in view of Bahl (see above note) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,015 B1 (Phillips).

Whalen describes delivery of information over narrow-band communications links.

Bahl discloses a method of supervising on the forward link in a high data rate system, wherein a base station transmits to an access terminal on a forward traffic channel only when the base station has data to send to the access terminal.

Phillips discloses a system of communication devices, methods and computer programs for establishing concurrent calls on a single TDMA frequency.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), the Examiner states the combination of Whalen and Bahl discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. More specifically the Examiner states that Whalen teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1, except for temporarily releasing an access to the network, upon failure to receive any web related operation command from the user for a predetermined time after displaying the web document (i.e., step (d) of Claim 1), which the Examiner states is taught by Bahl (e.g., see, Office Action, Pages 2-3, specifically bottom of page 3). (Note: Although the Examiner used the term “network,” in step (d) of Claim 1, this term was amended by the October 17, 2005 Amendment to read “web server” rather than “network.” Likewise, in step (d), the term “for” was replaced by “within.” Thus, the terms “web server” and “within” are used in this Response with respect to the rejection of

Claim 1.)

Upon reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. First, to support his rejection, the Examiner states that Whalen teaches the recitation of repeating steps (a)-(d), however, the Examiner admits that Whalen does not teach step (d) i.e., temporarily releasing complete access to the web server, upon failure to receive any web related operation command from the user within a predetermined time after displaying the web document. Second, the recitations contained in step (e) of Claim 1, assure that steps (i.e., steps a-d) are each repeated twice. This concept is neither taught nor suggested by Whalen. As Bahl does not cure the deficiencies of Whalen, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of under 35 U.S.C §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.


Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), Claim 8 includes similar recitations as contained in Claim 1, namely repeating steps (a-d). Phillips does not cure the deficiencies of Whalen and Bahl, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7 and 9, these are

likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent Claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/VAG/ml